



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,391	08/23/2005	Philippe Bastien	05725-1204	4451
22852	7590	02/19/2010		
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER KANAAN, MAROUN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/19/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/517,391

Applicant(s)

BASTIEN ET AL.

Examiner

MAROUN KANAAN

Art Unit

3626

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 December 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 and 92-97 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 and 92-97 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to the application 10517391 filed on 12/03/2009
2. Claims 1-85, and 92-97 are currently pending and have been examined.
3. Claims 86-91 have been canceled.
4. Claims 92-97 have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 95-97 as recited, are directed toward signals. Such signals can be interpreted as computer code, per se, which is not a statutory category and is therefore unpatentable. However, a computer program can be eligible for patent protection if it is tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium and, when executed by a computer, performs the steps of the invention. Appropriate correction is required.
7. Claims 95-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the descriptions or expressions of the programs, are not physical "things." They are neither computer components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and other claimed elements of a computer, which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a computer program is a computer element which defines structural and functional interrelationships between the computer program and the rest of the computer which permit the computer program's functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory. Accordingly, it is important to distinguish claims that define descriptive material per se from claims that define statutory inventions. Since a computer program is merely a set of instructions capable of being executed by a computer, the computer program itself is not a process and the Examiner therefore will treat a claim for a computer program, without the computer-readable medium needed to realize the computer program's functionality, as nonstatutory functional descriptive material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-5, 7-18, and 20-26, are rejected under 35. U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huyn et al. (US 2002/0035486 A1) in view of Goldman et al. (US 2002/0082738 A1).

10. As per claim 1 Huyn teaches a *diagnostic method, the method being executed by a computer system and comprising:*
- *providing a first question* (See at least Huyn, Para. 0014);

- *receiving first information reflecting an answer to the first question* (See at least Huyn, Para. 0014);
- *providing the second question* (See at least Huyn, Para. 70, wherein a primary question triggers presentation of secondary questions).
- *receiving second information reflecting an answer to the second question* (See at least Huyn, Para. 70, wherein positive responses to the secondary questions trigger further hierarchical levels of questions).
- *and determining, via the computer system, a diagnosis according to the diagnostic algorithm* (See at least Para. 0100, wherein patients receive diagnosis medical summary).
- *selecting, via the computer system, a second question according to the first information and according to a diagnostic algorithm generated using at least one of a multivariate analysis and a tree segmentation technique* (See at least Huyn Para. 92, wherein secondary questions are presented based on the response of the first question).

Huyn does not explicitly teach however Goldman teaches a multivariate analysis and a tree segmentation technique (See at least at least Goldman Para. 5, and Claim 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the medical art to combine computer-implemented questionnaire system as taught in Huyn with the different analysis techniques as taught in Goldman. The combination would lead to different analysis techniques that generate secondary questions based on the responses of the first question.

11. As per claim 2-5, Huyn teaches the claim limitations of claim 1. Huyn does not explicitly teach, however Goldman teaches:
12. *In claim 2, the method according to claim 1, wherein the diagnostic algorithm is generated using at least the multivariate analysis, and the multivariate analysis includes at least one of a principal component analysis, a factorial analysis, PLS path modeling, and structural equation modeling* (See at least Goldman, Para. 8 wherein factorial process is taught). The motivation to combine references is the same as seen in claim 1.
13. *In claim 3, the method according to claim 1, wherein the diagnostic algorithm is generated using at least the tree segmentation technique, and the tree segmentation technique includes a classification and regression tree method* (See at least Goldman, Claim 5, wherein regression tree (CART) is taught). The motivation to combine references is the same as seen in claim 1.
14. *In claim 4, the method according to claim 3, wherein the classification and regression tree method is at least one of a CART method, a CHAID method, and a QUEST method* (See at least Goldman, Claim 5, wherein regression tree (CART) is taught). The motivation to combine references is the same as seen in claim 1.
15. *In claim 5, the method according to claim 1, wherein the diagnostic algorithm is a diagnostic algorithm generated using at least both the multivariate analysis and the tree segmentation technique* (See at least Goldman, Para. 4, wherein various analysis is taught, and see also Para. 8 and Claim 5 where both techniques are taught). The motivation to combine references is the same as seen in claim 1.

16. As per claim 7, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 1, wherein the first question is a most discriminating question according to the tree segmentation technique* (See at least Para. 0070, wherein the first question is the broadest question).
17. As per claim 8, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 7, wherein the second question is, according to the tree segmentation technique and the answer to the first question, a second most discriminating question* (See at least Para. 0070 wherein the second question is the second broadest question and each question afterwards triggers a more specific question).
18. As per claim 9, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 1, wherein at least one of the first information and the second information is received from a remote location over a network* (See at least Para. 0101, wherein the questionnaire can be completed over the web).
19. As per claim 10, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 9, wherein the network is at least one of an internet, an intranet, a wireless network, and a wired network* (See at least Para. 0101, wherein the questionnaire can be completed over the web).
20. As per claim 11, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 1, wherein at least one of the first information and the second information is received from a portable electronic device* (See at least Para. 0101).

21. As per claim 12, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 11, wherein the portable electronic device is at least one of a handheld personal computer, a telephone, a mobile phone, a television set, and a personal organizer* (See at least Para. 0047 wherein a handheld personal computer is taught).
22. As per claim 13, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 1, further comprising:*
- *selecting at least one subsequent question according to the diagnostic algorithm* (See at least Para. 0071);
 - *providing the at least one subsequent question* (See at least Para. 0071);
 - *and receiving subsequent information reflecting at least one answer to the at least one subsequent question* (See at least Para. 0071) .
23. As per claim 14, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 13, wherein the selecting and providing of at least one subsequent question continues until the determining of the diagnosis* (See at least Fig. 10B).
24. As per claim 15, Huyn teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the diagnostic algorithm is a diagnostic algorithm generated by at least:
- *receiving, from a plurality of individuals, initial information reflecting answers to initial questions* (See at least Para. 0107);
 - *performing the multivariate analysis on the initial information received from the plurality of individuals to generate at least one synthetic variable* (See at least Fig. 18);

- *and generating the diagnostic algorithm from at least the synthetic variable using the tree segmentation technique (See at least Fig. 18).*
25. As per claim 16, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 1, wherein at least one of providing the first question and providing the second question comprises presenting, respectively, the first question or the second question at least one of over a network, at a kiosk, in a waiting room, at home, and at a point-of-sale* (See at least Para. 0101, wherein the questionnaire can be completed over the web).
26. As per claim 17, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 16, wherein at least one of providing the first question and providing the second question comprises presenting, respectively, the first question or the second question at least over the network, and the network includes at least one of an internet, an intranet, a wireless network, and a wired network* (See at least Para. 0101, wherein the questionnaire can be completed over the web).
27. As per claim 18, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 16, wherein at least one of providing the first question and providing the second question comprises presenting, respectively, the first question or the second question at least at the kiosk and the kiosk includes a display to present at least one of the first question and the second question* (See at least Fig. 10B).
28. As per claim 20, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 1, wherein the diagnosis is at least one of a dermatological diagnosis, a beauty diagnosis, and a cosmetic diagnosis* (See at least Fig. 14 wherein a graphical analysis is displayed for skin care questions).

29. As per claim 21, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 1, wherein the diagnosis relates to at least one of a skin characteristic and a keratin characteristic* (See at least Fig. 14 wherein a graphical analysis is displayed for skin care questions).
30. As per claim 22, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 21, wherein the diagnosis relates to at least the keratin characteristic, and the keratin characteristic relates to at least one of a hair, a nail, an eyelash, and an eyebrow* (See at least Fig. 15).
31. As per claim 23, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 1, wherein the diagnosis relates to at least one of a skin condition and a keratin condition* (See at least Fig. 15).
32. As per claim 24, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 23, wherein the diagnosis relates to at least the keratin condition, and keratin condition relates to at least one of a hair, a nail, an eyelash, and an eyebrow* (See at least Fig. 15).
33. As per claim 25, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 23, wherein diagnosis relates to at least the skin condition, and the skin condition includes at least one of greasy skin, dry skin, aging skin, wrinkled skin, marked skin, flask skin, squeamish skin, sensitive skin, skin phototype, a pigmented spot of skin, a problem with an eyelid, skin topography, a sensitive lip, a wrinkle around a lip, acne, and eczema* (See at least Para. 0069).
34. As per claim 26, Huyn teaches *the method according to claim 23, wherein the diagnosis relates to at least the keratin condition, and the keratin condition includes at least one of hair loss, hair shine, hair thickness, hair oiliness, hair health, hair graying, and hair color* (See at least Fig. 15).

Art Unit: 3626

Claims 19, 27-35, and 62-67 are rejected under 35. U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huyn et al. (US 2002/0035486 A1) in view of Sun et al. (US 2002/0022973 A1).

35. In regards to claim 19, Huyn teaches the claim limitations of claim 16, however Huyn does not explicitly teach but Sun teaches *the method according to claim 16, wherein at least one of providing the first question and providing the second question comprises presenting, respectively, the first question or the second question at least at the kiosk and the point-of-sale, and the point-of-sale is at least one of a product-selling store, a service providing location, and a website* (See at least Sun, Para. 0114, wherein the point-of-sale is a website). It would have been obvious to combine a computer-implemented questionnaire system for obtaining clinical data from subjects taught in Huyn with the questionnaire system offering recommended products for sale in Sun. The combination would enhance the way patients receive medical advice/services.
36. In regards to claim 27, Huyn teaches the claim limitations of claim 1, however Huyn does not explicitly teach but Sun teaches *further comprising selecting at least one product according to, at least in part, the diagnosis* (See at least Sun, Para. 0092 wherein prescribed or recommended medical treatment is taught). The motivation to combine both arts is the same as claim 19
37. In regards to claim 28, Huyn teaches the claim limitations of claim 1, however Huyn does not explicitly teach but Sun teaches *further comprising offering the product for sale* (See at least Sun, Para. 0114). The motivation to combine both arts is the same as claim 19.

38. In regards to claims 29 and 30, Huyn teaches the claim limitations of claim 1, however Huyn does not explicitly teach but Sun teaches wherein the product includes at least one of a good and a service (See at least Sun, Para. 0114 wherein a good product is shown and Para. 0115 wherein a service product is shown). Sun does not explicitly teach the product is a beauty product but that is a design choice and does not alter the claim limitations of the application. The motivation to combine both arts is the same as claim 19.
39. In regards to claim 31, Huyn teaches the claim limitations of claim 1, however Huyn does not explicitly teach but Sun teaches *further comprising providing at least one of advice and a recommendation according to, at least in part, the diagnosis* (See at least Sun, Para. 0076). The motivation to combine both arts is the same as claim 19.
40. In regards to claim 32, Huyn teaches the claim limitations of claim 1, however Huyn does not explicitly teach but Sun teaches *further comprising selecting at least one subject individual according to, at least in part, the diagnosis* (See at least Sun, Fig. 5H wherein a patient is selected). The motivation to combine both arts is the same as claim 19.
41. In regards to claims 33 and 34, Huyn teaches the claim limitations of claim 1, however Huyn does not explicitly teach but Sun teaches *wherein the subject individual exhibits a desired characteristic* (See at least Sun, Fig. 5i, wherein each patient exhibits a desired characteristic) Sun does not teach the desired characteristic is sensitive skin but that is a design choice and does not alter the claim limitations of the application. The motivation to combine both arts is the same as claim 19.

42. In regards to claim 35, Huyn teaches the claim limitations of claim 1, however Huyn does not explicitly teach but Sun teaches *further comprising evaluating a product on the subject individual* (See at least Sun Para. 0095 where a medical treatment is being physiological monitored as it is being administered to a patient). The motivation to combine both arts is the same as claim 19.
43. **Claims 62-67** recite substantially similar limitations as that already addressed in **19, and 27-35** and, as such, are rejected for similar reasons as given above.

Claims 6, 36-61, and 68-97 are rejected under 35. U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huyn et al. (US 2002/0035486 A1) in view of Goldman et al. (US 2002/0082738 A1) and in further in view of Nicholson et al. (US 2005/0130321 A1).

44. As per claims 6, 41, and 73, Huyn and Goldman teach the above claim limitations. Goldman further teaches *wherein the tree segmentation technique includes a classification and regression tree method* (See at least Goldman, Claim 5, wherein regression tree (CART) is taught). Huyn and Goldman do not explicitly teach however Nicholson teaches *the method according to claim 5, wherein the multivariate analysis includes a principal component analysis* (See at least Nicholson Para. 58).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the medical art to combine computer-implemented questionnaire system as taught in Huyn with the different analysis techniques as taught in Goldman further with the principal component technique as taught in Nicholson. The combination would lead to different analysis techniques that generate secondary questions based on the responses of the first question.

Art Unit: 3626

45. **Claims 36-40, 42-61, 68-72, and 74-97** recite substantially similar limitations as that already addressed in **1-18, 20-26**, and, as such, are rejected for similar reasons as given above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maroun Kanaan whose telephone number is (571) 270-1497. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the above noted Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Jerry O'Connor, can be reached at the following telephone number: (571) 272-6787.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to **571-273-8300**.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window:**

Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314.

Art Unit: 3626

/Maroun KANAAN/
Examiner, Art Unit 3626

/Robert Morgan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3626